

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 4, and 6, and 9-11 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Claim 4 has been canceled by this reply. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the identifier affixed to newly downloaded information and using which the information is searched for in the cache memory is a digital signature made using at least one portion of the information. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0034] and [0064] of the Publication of the present application (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0112245).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,368 ("Boucher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,404 ("Brotz"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,138 ("Lambert"). Claim 4 has been canceled by this reply, thus this rejection is now moot with respect to claim 4. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims have been amended to recite that the identifier affixed to newly downloaded information not present in cache memory and used to search the cache memory is a digital signature formed using at least one portion of the information. *See* Publication of present application, US Publication No. 2002/0112245, paragraphs [0034] and [0064]. Using such an identifier makes searching more efficient, and affixing such an identifier to downloaded information before the information is stored simplifies future searches of information in the cache memory. Applicants assert that none of Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation required by the amended claims.

Specifically, the Examiner relies on Figure 2, box 220, of Boucher as disclosing that information is search for in cache memory (*see* Office Action mailed March 23, 2007, page 2). However, Boucher fails to teach or suggest that the cache memory is searched using an identifier of the information, where the identifier is a digital signature made using at least one portion of the information being searched for. In fact, none of Boucher specifically teaches using any type of identifier to search the cache memory. Rather, Boucher simply states “the content browser can determine whether a rendered representation of the content already exists in the rendered cache,” (*see* Boucher, col. 8, ll. 48-51). Boucher is completely silent with respect to teaching any search mechanism or search criteria that may be used to more efficiently find information in the rendered cache.

Further, Brotz fails to supply that which Boucher lacks, as evidenced by the fact that Brotz is relied upon solely for the purpose of disclosing downloading updated information from a broadcast source and affixing the downloaded content with a duration of validity (*see* Office Action mailed March 23, 2007, page 3). Lambert also fails to supply that which Boucher and Brotz lack, as Lambert is relied upon solely for the purpose of teaching that the duration of

validity is based on the content of the information and that an identifier is affixed to the updated content before it is stored in the cache (*see* Office Action mailed March 23, 2007, page 4).

Further, the Examiner relies solely on Lambert as teaching “wherein an identifier is affixed to the updated information when it is stored in the cache memory, and wherein the identifier associated with the updated information is based on the content of the updated information,” (*see* Office Action mailed March 23, 2007, page 4). The cited portion of Lambert discloses “Every time the content is accessed...its last-modification date is recorded. If that last-modification date changes and s accessed subsequently to that change, then the object has not changed since the current last-modification date and the access time. That time interval can thus be treated as a sample of how often the object changes, i.e., its lifetime.” *See* Lambert, col. 32, ll. 49-57.

The Examiner asserts that the “sample” taught in the above-cited portion of Lambert is equivalent to the updated information. The “sample” that the Examiner refers to is a time interval, as clearly stated in Lambert. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner’s assertion is true, there is no *identifier affixed* to the sample (*i.e.*, the time interval between object changes) of Lambert, as clearly required by the independent claims of the present application. Furthermore, even if the time interval itself is taken as the identifier of the object, this time interval is not affixed to the object. The time interval of Lambert is simply observed as a lifetime of the object. In fact, nothing is actually affixed to updated content in Lambert. To come to the conclusion that an identifier is affixed to updated content in Lambert, the Examiner has clearly read the claim limitation overly broad or mischaracterized the teachings of Lambert, both of which are wholly improper.

In addition, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the identifier affixed to the updated content is a *digital signature* created using at least one portion of the updated content. Clearly, a time interval sample, as taught by Lambert, cannot possibly be equated to a digital signature made using components of the updated content.

In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert, whether considered separately or in combination. Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert. Dependent claims 6, 9, and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/040001).

Dated: June 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant